

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to resolve issues raised by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and for editorial purposes. In this regard, Applicant notes that withdrawn claims 4, 5, and 10 have been amended to facilitate rejoinder upon a finding of allowable subject matter in elected claim 1.

Since the above amendments are being made simply to respond to issues raised by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance, entry of the above amendments is respectfully requested.

Petition for Withdrawal of Finality of Office Action

Preliminarily, Applicant notes that a Petition to Withdraw Finality is being filed concurrently herewith, because it is believed that the final Office Action raises a number of issues in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, which were not necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

Drawings

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a). In this regard, the Examiner indicates that the drawings only disclose one roller.

In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite "at least one support roller (2)" instead of "support rollers". Thus, claim 1 includes an embodiment having only one roller, as disclosed in the drawings.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the objection to the drawings has been overcome, and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 11, and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In response, Applicant submits that the amended claims address each of the issues raised by the Examiner, as discussed below.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner indicates that --fixed-- should be inserted before “bearing”. While Applicant does not consider such to be necessary, Applicant has amended claim 1 accordingly to resolve this issue.

Also, the Examiner indicates that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “vice versa” in lines 9 and 11 of claim 1. While Applicant does not consider such to be necessary, Applicant has amended claim 1 accordingly to resolve this issue.

With respect to the Examiner's indication that the limitations “a first bending state” and “a second bending state” [in connection with the second arm] in line 11 of claim 1 have insufficient antecedent basis, Applicant submits that since these recitations include the word “a” rather than the word “the”, there should be no antecedent basis issue.

In regard to the Examiner's indication that the limitation “[the] bending state” in line 11 of claim 1 has insufficient antecedent basis, while Applicant considers that one skilled in the art would understand this recitation Applicant has amended the recitation at issue to “a bending state” to advance the prosecution.

Regarding claim 2, the Examiner indicates that --fixed-- should be inserted before “bearing”. While Applicant does not consider such to be necessary, Applicant has amended claim 2 accordingly to resolve this issue.

Also, the Examiner indicates that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “variable” in line 3 of claim 2. While Applicant does not consider such to be necessary, Applicant has amended claim 2 to delete this recitation to resolve this issue.

Regarding claims 3 and 6, the Examiner indicates that --fixed-- should be inserted before “bearing”. While Applicant does not consider such to be necessary, Applicant has amended claims 3 and 6 accordingly to resolve this issue.

In further regard to claim 6, the Examiner indicates that --support-- should be inserted before “rollers”. While Applicant does not consider such to be necessary, Applicant has amended claim 6 accordingly to resolve this issue.

Regarding claim 7, the Examiner indicates that --fixed-- should be inserted before “bearing”. While Applicant does not consider such to be necessary, Applicant has amended claim 7 accordingly to resolve this issue.

In further regard to claim 7, the Examiner indicates that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “around 2mm” in line 7 and that the term “around” is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. While Applicant considers that one skilled in the art would understand the meaning of this term, to advance the prosecution Applicant has amended claim 7 to delete the term “around”, so Applicant submits that these issues have been resolved.

With respect to claim 8, the Examiner indicates that the term “around” in the recitation “around 2 degrees” is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. While Applicant considers that one skilled in the art would understand the meaning of this term, to advance the prosecution Applicant has amended claim 8 to delete the term “around”, so Applicant submits that this issue has been resolved.

Regarding claim 12, the Examiner indicates that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “its pivot axis”. While Applicant considers that one skilled in the art would understand the meaning of this recitation, Applicant has amended this recitation to “said pivot axis”. In this regard, Applicant notes that claim 1 recites “a pivot axis”, so Applicant submits that the recitation “said pivot axis” in claim 12 has antecedent basis in claim 1, the claim upon which claim 12 depends.

In further regard to claim 12, the Examiner indicates that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the roller”, because the claims are directed to support rollers. While Applicant considers that one skilled in the art would understand the meaning of the recitation at issue, to advance the prosecution Applicant has amended the recitation at issue to “the support roller”.

In view of the above and the Examiner’s comments in the Office Action, Applicant has reviewed the claims and considers that the claimed invention is clear and definite and that it complies with current U.S. practice.

Thus, Applicant submits that the present claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter on page 6 of the Office Action dated August 23, 2010. Based on the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the present claims are now in condition for allowance, and thus allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 4, 2011

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce E. Kramer
Registration No. 33,725